

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	· FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/051,230	01/22/2002	Shinichi Kawamura	218335US0CONT	8868 15	
22850 75	590 10/02/2003		EXAMINER		
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.			RODEE, CHRISTOPHER D		
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,			1756		
			DATE MAILED: 10/02/2003		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

.•		A-S.
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	10/051,230	KAWAMURA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
•	Christopher D RoDee	1756
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	pears on the cover sheet with	th correspondenc address
THE REPLY FILED 12 September 2003 FAILS TO PL Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to inal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of App examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	o avoid abandonment of this a (1) a timely filed amendment deal (with appeal fee); or (3) a	pplication. A proper reply to a twhich places the application in
PERIOD FOR F	REPLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	•	
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WA 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The ave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext 7 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shorter	r than SIX MONTHS from the mailing of AS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS Of date on which the petition under 37 CF tension and the corresponding amount	date of the final rejection. F THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP FR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under
anned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	-	
 A Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>12 June 2003</u>. A 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 C 		
2.☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered	l because:	•
(a) \(\square\) they raise new issues that would require fur	ther consideration and/or sea	rch (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note	e below);	
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the applicatio issues for appeal; and/or	n in better form for appeal by	materially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cand	celing a corresponding numbe	er of finally rejected claims.
NOTE:		
3.☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rej	ection(s):	
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) wou canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	uld be allowable if submitted in	n a separate, timely filed amendment
5.⊠ The a)□ affidavit, b)□ exhibit, or c)⊠ request application in condition for allowance because:		considered but does NOT place the
75. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered by raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	pecause it is not directed SOL	ELY to issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendme explanation of how the new or amended claims		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follow	vs:	•
Claim(s) allowed:		•
Claim(s) objected to:		
Claim(s) rejected: <u>17-20,22,23,31-33,35,37-39 and</u>	<u>d 41</u> .	
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		>
B. The proposed drawing correction filed on	is a) □ approved or b) □ d	isapproved by the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Staten	nent(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No	(s)
0. ☐ Other: Attached Interview Summary		ORO Dem
		CHRISTOPHER RODEE PRIMARY EXAMINER

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the claims as presented include amounts of th unit having charge transporting properties in amounts substantially smaller than shown in the evidence of record. Taking applicants' calculations as accurate at the bottom of page 9 of the response, the charge transporting unit is only shown down to a value of 33 wt % (Example 4), while the claims include values down to 5 wt. %. It is apparent from the declaration evidence in the Table that E 1/2 values degrade as the amount of the charge transporting unit is reduced (compare Example 4 with Examples 1, 2, 3, and 5). Although the abrasion resistance improves as the amount of the unit (2) is increased, it is apparent that this comes at the cost of reduces sensitivity. This evidence does not show an unexpected result that has practical advantage because the evidence indicates that the photoconductor degrade at one extreme of their scope of protection. Thus, the evidence of record is not persuasive of overcome the rejections of record Further, the claims as presented have not been limited to the elected charge transporting unit and no evidence of record shows an unexpected result for other charge transporting units.

	Application N	lo.	Applicant(s)					
· Interview Summary	10/051,230		KAWAMURA ET	AL.				
interview Summary	Examiner		Art Unit					
	Christopher D	RoDee	1756					
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO	personnel):							
(1) <u>Christopher D RoDee</u> .	(3)							
(2) <u>Tom Blinka</u> .	(4)							
Date of Interview: 15 May 2003.								
Type: a)⊠ Telephonic b)□ Video Conference c)□ Personal [copy given to: 1)□ applicant 2)□ applicant's representative]								
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d)☐ Yes e)☒ No. If Yes, brief description:								
Claim(s) discussed: <u>Pending, rejected claims</u> .								
Identification of prior art discussed:								
Agreement with respect to the claims f)□ was reached. g)□ was not reached. h)□ N/A.								
Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Counsel and the Examiner discussed the Advisory Action. Possible further showings in declaration form that address claimed subject matter not presently represented in the evidence of record were discussed. The Examiner noted the need to include subject matter that spanned the compositional requirements of the claims in both amounts and additional monomers. No agreements were reached.								
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)								
THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.								
Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.		Examiner's signa	ature, if required	 _				

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by
 attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does
 not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,
 - (The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.